

**Remarks/Arguments**

**35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over WO Publication 01/06771 A1 to Johnson et al. (“Johnson”), in view of US PG Pub 2005/0086693 A1 to Shintani et al. (“Shintani”).

It is submitted that neither Johnson nor Shintani teach or suggest a system:

“a second option to individually select which of a plurality of types of channels are to be searched”

as recited by claim 1.

Johnson teaches a system where “a channel search program/routine preferably of a graphical user interface (GUI) e.g., a television programming or set-up menu, is adapted to allow the user to accomplish a channel search on only the currently selected signal input and/or enter information regarding the existence of various channels.” (page 3, lines 6-9) Johnson further teaches that “in order to further reduce the time necessary to perform channel detection, the various signal inputs 16, 26, 28, and 30 may only accept certain signal sources. For example, signal input 16 may only accept DBS/Set-top box type television signals and thus only those channels what are typical of DBS/Set-top box signals. Signal inputs 28 and 30 may only accept terrestrial or off-air television signals (VHF/UHF) that only carry characteristic channels ...” (Page 6, lines 12-19) “Upon selection of a channel scan by the user, preferably within the screen of a GUI, a channel search is started on the channels characteristic of the signal input. (page 7, lines 8-10) Thus, the user may select a signal input for channel search, each input can only receive signals with certain characteristics, and once the channel search is started for a particular input, only signal types characteristic with that particular input, i.e. ATSC/NTSC, Cable, DBS, etc, are searched for. Johnson does not teach or suggest that the user selects a “which of a plurality of types of channels are to be searched” as recited in claim 1, but Johnson teaches that only the types of signals characteristic of that particular input are searched for. So according to

Johnson, satellite channels are not searched for on signal inputs used for receiving terrestrial broadcasts.

Shintani teaches “a method for use in generating a television channel map can select a first input of a plurality of inputs, select a first single modulation scheme of a plurality modulation schemes on the first input, tune in a plurality of channels for the identified single modulation scheme, determine if a broadcast is received on each of the channels, record channels that are determined to receive broadcasts in a channel map according to the plurality of tuned channels for the identified single modulation scheme, and not perform a full auto-program.” (Shintani paragraph 0006)

Johnson further teaches that “a user can manually activate the enhanced auto-programming and select one or more of the specific modulation schemes to evaluate.” (Shintani, paragraph 0033)

However, Shintani does not disclose providing options for both individual control over which inputs are scanned and which channel types are scanned. The system of Shintani would require the user to at least initiate multiple scans, one for each input to be scanned and one for each type of modulation scheme, thereby failing to provide much of the benefit of the presently claimed invention.

Thus, each of the cited references permit the user to select a particular input and/or channel, with a single modulation scheme for each. None of the cited references teach or suggest a user interface where a user can select from a plurality of inputs and modulation schemes to be searched in a single search. Each of the cited references teach system with either complete channel scans or individual input scans with a single modulation scheme. Thus, the systems of the cited references suffer from the very problems addressed by the present invention.

Further, it is submitted that the invention recited in claim 1 is non-obvious in light of the cited references and the “knowledge of one skilled in the art” at the time of the invention, as both of these solutions address the same problem as the present invention, yet

each cited references comes up short in teaching a complete solution, such as that of the present invention.

In view of the above remarks and amendments to the claims, it is respectfully submitted that there is no 35 USC 112 enabling disclosure provided by Johnson or Shintani, alone or in combination, that makes the present invention as claimed in currently amended claim 1 unpatentable. It is also respectfully submitted that currently amended independent claim 7 and 13 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Since dependent claims 2-6, 8-12, and 14-18 are dependent from allowable independent claims 1, 7, and 13, it is submitted that they too are allowable for at least the same reasons that their respective independent claims are allowable. Thus, it is further respectfully submitted that this rejection has been satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's representative at (609) 734-6804, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

No fee is believed due. However, if a fee is due, please charge the additional fee to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,

/brian j cromarty/

By: Brian J Cromarty  
Reg. No. L0027  
Phone (609) 734-6804

Patent Operations  
Thomson Licensing Inc.  
P.O. Box 5312  
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312  
June 2, 2009